

PATENT COOPERATION TREATY

PCT

INTERNATIONAL PRELIMINARY EXAMINATION REPORT

(PCT Article 36 and Rule 70)

27
Translation

Applicant's or agent's file reference PF04D980	FOR FURTHER ACTION See Notification of Transmittal of International Preliminary Examination Report (Form PCT/IPEA/416)	
International application No. PCT/JP99/00467	International filing date (day/month/year) 03 February 1999 (03.02.99)	Priority date (day/month/year) 03 February 1998 (03.02.98)
International Patent Classification (IPC) or national classification and IPC G09G 5/36, 5/00, H04N 5/74		
Applicant SEIKO EPSON CORPORATION		

1. This international preliminary examination report has been prepared by this International Preliminary Examining Authority and is transmitted to the applicant according to Article 36.

2. This REPORT consists of a total of 8 sheets, including this cover sheet.

☐ This report is also accompanied by ANNEXES, i.e., sheets of the description, claims and/or drawings which have been amended and are the basis for this report and/or sheets containing rectifications made before this Authority (see Rule 70.16 and Section 607 of the Administrative Instructions under the PCT).

These annexes consist of a total of _____ sheets.

3. This report contains indications relating to the following items:

- I ☒ Basis of the report
- II ☐ Priority
- III ☐ Non-establishment of opinion with regard to novelty, inventive step and industrial applicability
- IV ☒ Lack of unity of invention
- V ☒ Reasoned statement under Article 35(2) with regard to novelty, inventive step or industrial applicability; citations and explanations supporting such statement
- VI ☐ Certain documents cited
- VII ☐ Certain defects in the international application
- VIII ☐ Certain observations on the international application

Date of submission of the demand 16 August 1999 (16.08.99)	Date of completion of this report 21 April 2000 (21.04.2000)
Name and mailing address of the IPEA/JP	Authorized officer
Facsimile No.	Telephone No.

INTERNATIONAL PRELIMINARY EXAMINATION REPORT

International application No.

PCT/JP99/00467

I. Basis of the report

1. With regard to the elements of the international application:*

- ☒ the international application as originally filed
- ☐ the description:
pages _____, as originally filed
pages _____, filed with the demand
pages _____, filed with the letter of _____
- ☐ the claims:
pages _____, as originally filed
pages _____, as amended (together with any statement under Article 19
pages _____, filed with the demand
pages _____, filed with the letter of _____
- ☐ the drawings:
pages _____, as originally filed
pages _____, filed with the demand
pages _____, filed with the letter of _____
- ☐ the sequence listing part of the description:
pages _____, as originally filed
pages _____, filed with the demand
pages _____, filed with the letter of _____

2. With regard to the language, all the elements marked above were available or furnished to this Authority in the language in which the international application was filed, unless otherwise indicated under this item.
These elements were available or furnished to this Authority in the following language _____ which is:

- ☐ the language of a translation furnished for the purposes of international search (under Rule 23.1(b)).
- ☐ the language of publication of the international application (under Rule 48.3(b)).
- ☐ the language of the translation furnished for the purposes of international preliminary examination (under Rule 55.2 and/ or 55.3).

3. With regard to any nucleotide and/or amino acid sequence disclosed in the international application, the international preliminary examination was carried out on the basis of the sequence listing:

- ☐ contained in the international application in written form.
- ☐ filed together with the international application in computer readable form.
- ☐ furnished subsequently to this Authority in written form.
- ☐ furnished subsequently to this Authority in computer readable form.
- ☐ The statement that the subsequently furnished written sequence listing does not go beyond the disclosure in the international application as filed has been furnished.
- ☐ The statement that the information recorded in computer readable form is identical to the written sequence listing has been furnished.

4. ☐ The amendments have resulted in the cancellation of:

- ☐ the description, pages _____
- ☐ the claims, Nos. _____
- ☐ the drawings, sheets/fig _____

5. ☐ This report has been established as if (some of) the amendments had not been made, since they have been considered to go beyond the disclosure as filed, as indicated in the Supplemental Box (Rule 70.2(c)).**

* Replacement sheets which have been furnished to the receiving Office in response to an invitation under Article 14 are referred to in this report as "originally filed" and are not annexed to this report since they do not contain amendments (Rule 70.16 and 70.17).

** Any replacement sheet containing such amendments must be referred to under item 1 and annexed to this report.

INTERNATIONAL PRELIMINARY EXAMINATION REPORT

International application No.

PCT/JP99/00467

IV. Lack of unity of invention

1. In response to the invitation to restrict or pay additional fees the applicant has:

- ☐ restricted the claims.
- ☒ paid additional fees.
- ☐ paid additional fees under protest.
- ☐ neither restricted nor paid additional fees.

2. ☐ This Authority found that the requirement of unity of invention is not complied with and chose, according to Rule 68.1, not to invite the applicant to restrict or pay additional fees.

3. This Authority considers that the requirement of unity of invention in accordance with Rules 13.1, 13.2 and 13.3 is

- ☐ complied with.
- ☒ not complied with for the following reasons:

See supplemental sheet for continuation of Box IV.3

4. Consequently, the following parts of the international application were the subject of international preliminary examination in establishing this report:

- ☒ all parts.
- ☐ the parts relating to claims Nos. _____

Supplemental Box

(To be used when the space in any of the preceding boxes is not sufficient)

Continuation of: IV. 3.

Claims 1 to 10 and 22 relate to an invention for superposing and displaying two related images (hereinafter referred to as "Invention 1") and Claims 11 to 21, 23 and 24 relate to an invention displaying a specific image when certain displaying conditions are fulfilled (display actions), (hereinafter referred to as "Invention 2").

Invention 1 has the special technical feature of "displaying simultaneously at least the sections of a plurality of pages of presentation images which are related (specification, page 1, lines 12 and 13) with respect to the prior art which "conventionally displays a plurality of pages of related presentation images while switching between them" (specification, page 1, lines 12 and 13). Meanwhile Invention 2 has the special technical feature with respect to the prior art of "when no image is input into the projection display device, nothing is displayed on the screen" (specification page 1, line 25 to page 2, line 1), or "displaying the above-mentioned specific image, in such a case" (specification, page 2, lines 2 and 3).

Therefore, these inventions do not have "a technical relationship involving one or more of the same or corresponding technical features" as stipulated in PCT Rule 13.2.

Consequently, the invention disclosed in Claims 1 to 10 and 22 and the invention disclosed in Claims 11 to 21, 23 and 24 do not fulfil the requirement of unity of invention.

INTERNATIONAL PRELIMINARY EXAMINATION REPORT

International application No.
PCT/JP 99/00467

V. Reasoned statement under Article 35(2) with regard to novelty, inventive step or industrial applicability; citations and explanations supporting such statement

1. Statement

Novelty (N)	Claims	1-24	YES
	Claims		NO
Inventive step (IS)	Claims		YES
	Claims	1-24	NO
Industrial applicability (IA)	Claims	1-24	YES
	Claims		NO

2. Citations and explanations

Document 1: JP, 5-46135, A (Sony Corp.), February 26, 1993 (26.02.93), page 2, left column, line 14 to line 16; page 2, left column, line 40 to page 3, left column, line 21; Fig. 1 to 9

Document 2: JP, 6-295339, A (Seiko Epson Corp.), October 21, 1994 (21.10.94), page 2, right column, line 36 to line 39; page 3, left column, line 4 to line 17; page 4, left column, line 20 to page 9, left column, line 4; Fig. 1 to 18

Document 3: JP, 4-168478, A (Pentel Co., Ltd.), June 16, 1992 (16.06.92), page 1, lower right column, line 8 to line 11

Document 4: JP, 56-67445, A (Tokyo Shibaura Electric Co., Ltd.), June 6, 1981 (06.06.81), page 6, lower left column, line 12 to page 7, upper right column, line 11; Fig. 1 to 9

Document 5: JP, 6-86165, A (Matsushita Electric Industrial Co., Ltd.), March 25, 1994 (25.03.94), full text; Fig. 1 and 2

Document 6: JP, 5-183853, A (Motohiro Seisakusho K.K.),
July 23, 1993 (23.07.93), full text; Fig. 1

Document 7: JP, 4-284495, A (Fujitsu Ltd.), October 9,
1992 (09.10.92), full text; Fig. 1 to 6

Document 8: JP, 59-276, A (NEC Corp.), January 5, 1984
(05.01.84), full text; Fig. 1 to 2

Document 9: JP, 62-276672, A (Fanuc Ltd.), December 1,
1987 (01.12.87), page 2, upper left column,
line 8 to 10; Fig. 1 and 2

Claim 1

Documents 1 and 2 disclose display devices provided with an image extraction section which extracts at least one part of the first image data as an extraction image, an image extraction memory (equivalent to memory (21) in Document 1 and image memory (310) in Document 3) and an image superposing section.

Document 3 discloses a display device provided with a light modulation means and an optical system for projecting light onto a screen.

Applying a light modulation means and an optical system to a display device is a known and obvious practice. Therefore, Claim 1 does not involve an inventive step in the light of Documents 1 and 2.

Claim 2

Documents 1 to 3:

Document 2 indicates that conventionally there is a need to set a certain shape of the superimposed region (see page 3, left column, lines 8 to 9) and it is known and obvious practice to make it so that it can be optionally set.

Claim 3

Documents 1 to 3:

Document 2 indicates that the superimposed region is defined on the screen of a colour monitor by an operator (see page 6, left column, lines 5 to 7) and it is known and obvious practice to arrange the extraction image in the desired position of the source image.

Claim 4

Documents 1 to 4:

Document 4 discloses a device having a plurality of superimposed images. It is known and obvious practice to apply the feature of superimposing a plurality of image data in one specified position.

Claims 5 and 6

Documents 1 to 4:

Page buffer (12) of Document 4 is equivalent to the frame memory of Claim 5. It is known and obvious practice to provide a frame memory to an image superposing section.

Claim 7

Documents 1 to 4:

Documents 1 and 2 disclose the feature of providing a data selector. It is known and obvious practice to provide a data selector to a composition section.

Claims 8, 9 and 10

Documents 1 to 5:

Document 5 discloses forming the image composition section from a multiplication section and an addition section, which is known and obvious practice.

Claims 11 and 14 to 24

Documents 1 to 4, 6 and 7:

Documents 6 and 7 disclose displaying a specific image under specific display conditions, which is a known and obvious practice.

Claim 12

Documents 1 to 4 and 8

Document 8 discloses enlarging and reducing an image to be composed, which is a known and obvious practice.

Claim 13

Documents 1 to 4 and 6 to 9

Document 9 discloses using a first black-line frame and a second black-line frame placed within the first frame when displaying a frame, which is known and obvious practice.